

I

The Radical Editors

A Profile of Editors of the German-American Radical Press, 1850–1910

Paradoxically, the state of our knowledge of the German-American radical press is both substantial and limited. With respect to the radical tradition of the 48ers, a considerable body of interpretative literature has been available for some time.¹ Carl Wittke devoted almost one-third of *The German-Language Press in America*, published in 1957, to the revitalizing effects of those intellectuals and journalists who had been involved in revolutionary activities in one way or other and who, after emigrating to the United States, founded papers or joined the editorial staffs of existing ones.² Likewise, A. E. Zucker in his "Biographical Dictionary of the Forty-Eighters" published important biographical data on prominent individuals who served on German-American papers in some capacity; his list of the professions of the persons he included in his dictionary is led by the category "journalist."³ However, by way of example these works also show what a limited notion of German-American radical journalism the received view has had: Since it concentrated on this group of radical democrats, it was also confined to a relatively short time period, basically to the dozen years before the Civil War. The important social democratic, socialist, anarchist, and trade-union publications founded in the last third of the nineteenth century by newly arriving German immigrants, so different from the earlier group in socioeconomic as well as in political terms, have been almost completely neglected. Thus, Wittke conceded a scant six pages to those papers, and he did not even seem to be aware of the substantial number of German-language trade-union publications. Only in recent years has the post-Civil War radical press received the

attention it rightly deserves; however, a comprehensive interpretation has yet to be written.⁴

This essay will concentrate on the German-American radical press for the period from the Civil War to World War I, using the findings on the 48er radical journalists and press for comparative purposes. It is based on the following hypotheses: Wittke's argument of the juvenescence of the German-American press in the wake of the 48er arrivals can also be applied to the later radical journalism of socialist and anarchist persuasion. Although grounded in a different social and institutional setting, and therefore quickly adapting to a changing American journalistic landscape and addressing a new clientele, these new radical papers again helped raise linguistic and cultural standards that had been weakened as a result of social, cultural, and language adaptation. The post-Civil War radical press, like its predecessor, was able to serve this invigorating function because of the transfer of experience, skills, and ideology by editors many of whom had professional experience before emigrating. This transfer was decisive not only in the initial phase of founding a paper but also at a later stage when a paper's orientation gradually began to shift according to the changed interests of its readership. The German-American radical press of the post-Civil War period retained its vitality so long as it was able to replenish its editorial staff with immigrating journalists. It began to face serious trouble when the gap widened between an audience more and more assimilated into American mainstream culture and an editorial staff nurtured in German (high) culture.

A methodological note is in order at this point. A study of the personal backgrounds and career patterns of editors and journalists seems to me a useful approach to confirm (or refute) the claim made here that these individuals played a central role in the development, direction, appearance, and quality of the papers. Did individual career patterns display similarities that allow for making generalizations? The approach of this essay is therefore that of collective biography. However, biographical data for a substantial number of editors are (still) incomplete; they are available for prominent editors and journalists only and are thus not comprehensive enough to make a careful statistical analysis. More detailed information is available for only some forty editors, whereas many more were active during the time period considered here (see Appendix).⁵ Despite these evident limitations, a characteristic pattern emerges from the available data, which justifies sketching a profile of these editors and journalists.

Institutional Setting

First it is necessary to describe the institutional setting in which the post-Civil War press operated. A major change had taken place in comparison with the German-American newspaper scene of the 1850s. Newspapers and journals then were either profit-oriented enterprises run according to market dictates and therefore adapting to commercial as well as political pressures or the creations of idealistic individuals inspired by humanitarian, cultural, and political convictions who sacrificed their (and often their families') time, money, and health for their zealous work. Such personal journalism succumbed to the crass materialism of Gilded-Age America. Only Karl Heinzen was able to continue his *Pionier* until 1879 with the help of his wife and the financial assistance of friends. After Heinzen's paper merged with the *Freidenker*, Robert Reitzel's *Der arme Teufel*, launched in 1884, proved to be the sole exception to the rule that papers reflecting the personal opinions of their editors had become outmoded.

The radical press that emerged after the Civil War was closely linked to the German-American labor movement and its various organizations. It also had to operate in highly competitive surroundings and accordingly had to adapt to commercial and market considerations by increasingly opening its pages to advertisements and by satisfying the needs of its readers for general information in competition with middle-class German-American dailies as well as English-language papers. But it could never have survived on a purely competitive basis without the special organizational frame on which it was usually founded, i.e., the cooperative association, and without the support of labor organizations and their members.

Obviously, newspaper associations founded in Germany by the Social Democracy set the precedent for this organizational structure. Section I of the International Workingmen's Association (IWA) passed statutes for the *Arbeiterzeitung* in 1873 which provided for membership control of the paper through an administrative committee and a board of supervision elected by the members.⁶ The founding of the Social Democratic Labor party of North America in 1874 was accompanied by the establishment of a paper, the *Social-Demokrat*, which was owned by the party. The Social Democratic Printing Association, founded at the same time, was a stock company which party members could join by acquiring shares of \$5 each.⁷ The example copied in this case is obvious: It was that of the publishing house and print shop of the *Social-Demokrat*, the paper of the General German Workingmen's Association. Members of the Labor party of Illinois requested

the statutes of the Berlin and Leipzig cooperative publishing houses in 1875 in order to follow these precedents when establishing a cooperative association for the Chicago *Vorbote*.⁸ More typical, however, were local papers not controlled by a party but jointly owned by trade unions, by mutual benefit or other societies, or by individual party and trade-union members who had founded a cooperative publishing association.

The example of the *Milwaukee's Socialist* may serve to show the typical steps taken when founding a labor paper. The Milwaukee section of the IWA was able to publish the paper, beginning on November 1, 1875, "with little means at its disposal," because comrade Joseph Brucker "selflessly contributed his print equipment." About one year later plans materialized to found a publishing association in order to become independent of other publishers. Although the German-American Typographical Union No. 10 had only thirty members in Milwaukee at the time, it was confident, despite warnings to the contrary, that this was the right course; for "the establishments of our German colleagues in Berlin, Munich, Frankfurt, Leipzig, Chemnitz, Crimmitschau etc. give the best proof that such [publishing associations] can exist, if managed on an expert basis." In this case, too, shares of five dollars each were issued. The printing house eventually began operations on February 1, 1877. In addition to the *Milwaukee's Socialist* it set and printed the weekly *Vorwärts* as well as the English-language *Social Democrat*, and the *Emancipator* of Cincinnati, and it also took on job printing. The associational form guaranteed the democratic management and control of the company.⁹

In spite of confident expectations, the publishing association floundered and failed in the summer of 1877 because of personal antagonisms, the low circulation of the *Milwaukee's Socialist*, wages for the typesetters and printers that were lower than those paid by capitalistic enterprises, and competition by two other publishing associations in Chicago and St. Louis. The Socialist Printing Company in Milwaukee bought the association in order to save the paper, but one year later it was discontinued and the company dissolved. The example demonstrates that in the United States, as in Germany, "in several cases local organs were founded rashly, without the necessary financial and personal prerequisites and without the necessary minimum number of subscribers."¹⁰

In those cases where solid preparations were made, as in Chicago and New York, papers were put on a lasting, if financially shaky, basis. The *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung* succeeded because it was preceded by the weekly *Vorbote*, which tried out various organizational forms and

secured a permanent circle of readers, and because it appeared on a triweekly basis for two years before it was turned into a daily in the spring of 1879. Members (and in later years trade unions also) were guaranteed adequate participation in the Socialistic Publishing Society, a nonprofit association.¹¹ The *New Yorker Volkszeitung* (NYVZ), on the other hand, was to appear as a daily from the very beginning, and various preparations had to be made to ensure its success: In addition to founding the Socialistic Cooperative Publishing Association and selling shares to party and union members, members solicited subscriptions several weeks before publication began. In fact, 278 members of the Socialist Labor party systematically canvassed city wards, precincts, and blocks in New York and Brooklyn until some four thousand persons had subscribed to the paper.¹² Not surprisingly, however, its appearance negatively affected the party paper, *Arbeiterstimme*, also published in New York. The latter quickly lost so many subscribers that it had to fold up.¹³

Remarks by the experienced editor Carl Hirsch, characterizing the condition of the social democratic press in Germany in the 1870s, are even more appropriate for the American situation. He observed, "It is a fact that the majority of our local papers to this day can only be maintained because of great circumspection and willingness to make personal sacrifices. Most party members do not know of the sacrifices in terms of money, time and energy demanded by our party press since its emergence."¹⁴ Since in the United States institutional bases for a radical labor press did not survive the Civil War and had to be created anew afterwards, the contributions of many members and the use of the associational or shareholding model after the German example was the only available alternative which, despite many drawbacks and disappointments, led to the founding of permanent high-quality newspapers.

Backgrounds and Career Patterns

Describing the origins and the ten-year history of the NYVZ in 1888, Alexander Jonas, the paper's editor-in-chief, observed: "There never was, and still isn't up to this day, an abundance of persons who thoroughly understand the theory of modern socialism, who know how to present it in clear and graphic ways and who besides—or rather primarily—are journalists."¹⁵ While the German-American radical press needed experienced journalists, especially during the period of its enormous expansion in the 1870s and 1880s, it could not readily draw upon a reserve of persons with an adequate professional back-

ground. It thus had to rely on the social democratic movement in Germany for recruits. For example, in 1875 Jacob Winnen asked the German party for help in finding a competent replacement for the *Vorbote's* editor, Conrad Conzett, explaining that the paper's board "cannot come by anybody in the United States trained in social science matters and prominent enough to satisfy our needs." Winnen continued: "We don't know of any other way to solve the problem but to turn to you and ask you to help us out of this dilemma, if at all possible. . . . Perhaps a party member with prior experience in the party press who would make for a capable editor might be willing to emigrate, if he found immediate and certain employment."¹⁶ How successful was the German-American radical press in attracting editors and journalists from Germany?

Many persons who took over responsibility for a paper in the United States obviously had some previous experience in journalism in Germany, although not necessarily as chief editors. Gustav Lyser, for example, had been an assistant editor for social democratic papers in Chemnitz and Braunschweig before coming to New York at the age of thirty-three and assuming the editorship of the *Social-Demokrat*, the organ of the Social Democratic party of North America, in 1874. Thirty years later, when he entered the United States at the age of thirty, Heinrich Bartel could also look back on ten years of journalistic experience on the editorial staffs of the *Freiheit* and *Volkswille* in northern Bohemia.¹⁷ The low median age upon immigration (thirty-two) of this group of journalists is a clear indication that they were usually in mid-career, that is, they had already been adherents of social democracy for ten to fifteen years and were well on their way to more responsible positions within the movement, which they attained not in Germany but in the United States.

Some of them were already quite prominent. Their reasons for emigrating were persecution and the precariousness of their economic status. Thus Julius Vahlteich, former secretary to Ferdinand Lassalle, social democratic delegate to the Imperial Diet, and editor of the party's local paper *Chemnitzer Freie Presse*, emigrated in 1881, as did the venerable Friedrich Wilhelm Fritzsche, also a member of the Diet, president of the German Cigarmakers Union, and editor of its weekly paper. Both had toured the United States on an official visit in the spring of 1881. Paul Grottkau, prominent labor leader from Berlin, editor of the organ of the Bricklayers Union and of the *Berliner Freie Presse*, barely escaped the Prussian police in 1878, when they tried to arrest him once again. The gifted writer and orator immediately found employment on the staff of the *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung* and

Vorbote.¹⁸ In a few cases German-American papers offered their chief editorial position to experienced German editors, as in the case of the *Social-Demokrat* (*Arbeiterstimme*). August Otto-Walster came to New York from Dresden at the request of the paper's owner, the Social Democratic Labor party of North America.¹⁹ The more prominent émigrés were older than the average: Joseph Dietzgen and Fritzsche were already beyond their mid-fifties, Vahlteich and Otto-Walster were both forty-two.

Most sizeable was that group of journalists who sought refuge because of various kinds of political persecution. Notorious in this respect was the period of antisocialist legislation from 1878 to 1890.²⁰ However, even before that law went into effect, several journalists left after having been harassed or repeatedly jailed, like Grottkau, Rudolf Starke from Basel (1870), and Jacob Franz from Munich (1878). After October 1878, the German social democratic press, and along with it the whole infrastructure of the party's communication network, was completely destroyed. Editors and printers lost their means of livelihood and many were banned from their hometowns. A large number of persecuted or exiled socialists who had been involved in some capacity in publishing and distributing social democratic papers emigrated to the United States, among them journalists who sought to continue their careers there (Hasselman, Vahlteich, Lossau, Hepner, Christensen, Ibsen, Stoehr, Keitel, Milke, Most, Rosenberg, Werner, Reimer, Schlüter). In the face of a limited number of jobs, it was difficult for them to gain a foothold. Vahlteich, for example, had to resort to his old shoemaker's trade in New York. Only after he moved to Chicago did he find employment with a middle-class paper, before taking on the editorship of the short-lived *Illinois Volkszeitung* (and later of other papers). Hasselman opened a saloon in New York; the paper which he founded several years later failed after six months. Most of them did finally find a niche in the German-American labor press, and some became very successful editors, like Johann Most (*Freiheit*), Adolph Hepner (*St. Louis Tageblatt*) and Hermann Schlüter (NYVZ). Others were quickly forgotten, however, after continuing their journalistic career for only a short time. Jens Christensen had to give up his position as editor of the *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung* after a year and a half; he died in the poorhouse in New York.

Among German-American editors there was another group—those who were under twenty-five when they immigrated and who first entered the profession in the United States, like August Spies, Michael Schwab, and Robert Schilling. They were a relatively small minority; out of thirty-four persons whose age at immigration is known, only

seven were under twenty-five. It may not be a coincidence that among them were found two printers (Conzett, Fischer) and one bookbinder (Schwab). These trades, connected as they were with publishing, had been the traditional resources for labor journalists from artisan and craft ranks. Other workers more advanced in their life cycles when entering the United States had already made this career move in Germany (Franz, Lyser, Most), while for these younger people, becoming an editor still lay ahead.

A slim majority of editors had working-class backgrounds. They were the self-educated who had learned a craft like cabinetmaking (Speyer), shoemaking (Vahlteich), tanning (Dietzgen), tailoring (Carl and Starke), or weaving, who helped organize their respective trades or a labor party and assumed positions of responsibility in the process, and who founded, or gradually took over the editorship of, labor papers. This was strongest among printers and bookbinders, one dozen of whom could be identified. On the other hand, there was a strong minority of intellectuals among these labor journalists, most of them apparently of middle-class background. They had studied at German universities (Berger, Christensen, Douai, Drescher, Hasselmann, Heinzen, Hepner, Jonas, Lore, Otto-Walster, Reitzel, Rosenberg, Schwitsch, Landsberg). Not all of them can be said to have really belonged to the labor movement. As Jonas pointed out, when the NYVZ was launched some professional journalists who were not socialists had to be hired for lack of capable party members, and he himself had to learn from experience how to publish a daily labor paper. Sometimes recourse had to be taken to sympathizing liberals; thus the lawyer Dr. Wilhelm Landsberg became the first editor of the *New Yorker Arbeiter-Union*, before Dr. Adolf Douai replaced him; and when Grottkau was forced out of the editorship of the *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung* and *Vorbote* in 1880, Dr. Liebig took over. He apparently proved inadequate for the job, and Grottkau was reinstituted.

Thus there was a certain heterogeneity of backgrounds, especially when including editors of both trade-union publications and socialist as well as other radical dailies and weeklies. But there were no clear-cut boundaries between these different types of papers when it came to their editorial staffs; moves from one paper to another were readily made. Karl Ibsen (*Deutsch-Amerikanische Bäckerzeitung*, *Cleveland Volksfreund*), Robert Degen (*Deutsch-Amerikanische Bäckerzeitung*, NYVZ), and Jacob Franz (*Philadelphia Tageblatt*, NYVZ, *Brauerzeitung*) consecutively worked for both socialist dailies and trade-union papers. Even more important, however, was the convergence of experience in the United States, because of the need to fulfill several important func-

tions through the editorial position. The labor paper was such a central institution in the labor movement that whoever held the editorship not only dominated public opinion but had other leadership functions as well: as union and party organizer and representative and as speaker during demonstrations, strikes, and other important public events. Also typical was a high degree of geographical and job mobility, partly because of the precarious financial standing of many radical papers, and partly because of personnel changes in the movement and ideological shifts in the papers' editorial policies. Thus editors did not make easy and uninterrupted transitions from one job to the next, but were often unemployed for several months and sometimes had to make a living in between through other means. And they certainly did not gather riches. Jens L. Christensen may have been an exception in that he died in a poorhouse. But all of them were overworked and received relatively low pay. Jonas quoted the following salaries for the editorial staff of the NYVZ during its first two-and-a-half years in the late 1870s, while the paper was in the red: "A. Douai \$16.00 per week, Alex. Jonas \$14.00, R. Degen \$12.00, J. Schaefer \$11.00 and J. Holler \$11.00. For comparative purposes let me add that the average wage of a typesetter for one week (six days' work) was then about \$16.00, that of a foreman \$25.00."²¹

Comparing these radical journalists who arrived later to the 48er generation yields some remarkable similarities as well as differences. Both groups contained a high percentage of experienced journalists with some kind of university training. While hardly any of the earlier immigrants left Germany of their own free will, many, but not all, of the socialists also were forced out of their home country. Missing among the latter is the category of intellectuals who were inexperienced in journalism but entered the profession in the United States as a last resort. In order to be accepted in the emerging German-American labor movement, individuals had to be soundly grounded in it; they had to be willing to make the personal sacrifices that were apparently a prerequisite for the job; thus in the flowering period of the German-American labor press outsiders were an exception. In later years, because of an increasing shortage of qualified editors—after 1890 these preferred to remain in Germany where the Social Democracy and its press became important social and political factors—the German-American labor press sometimes had to turn to other expedients. Although information is still scarce, there are indications that older editors who in Germany might have been succeeded by a younger generation were unable to retire in the United States because no one else was there to take over. Julius Vahlteich was in his sixties

when he accepted a position with the NYVZ; he helped out at the *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung* when he was already seventy years old, and he worked for the paper almost until his death in 1915 at the age of seventy-six.²² This is just one example demonstrating that the ranks of the guardians of German cultural traditions were thinning out.

Cultural Traditions and Adaptations

Editors of the post-Civil War German-American radical press were steeped in the German social democratic tradition and in many ways served as its most important agents of transfer and preservation. This cannot equally be claimed for freethinking and Turner journals, although their editors also immigrated. Individuals like Carl Hermann Boppe of the *Freidenker* and Reitzel continued the 48er liberal democratic tradition, often in increasing contrast and opposition to their readers, who became more conservative as time passed. The labor press also counted some of its able journalists from among the ranks of these 48er radicals, the most prominent being Adolf Douai, who eventually turned into a social democrat. More often the liberals (e.g., Dr. Ernst Schmidt, Friedrich Adolph Sorge, Dr. Georg Stiebeling) pursued careers other than journalism, while regularly contributing essays, stories, and scholarly articles to journals and the labor papers' Sunday editions.

The youthful German-American movement badly needed journalists with both organizational experience and knowledge of the workings of labor institutions in general and of the press as the major means of communication. Therefore the transfer of personnel was as important as copying the organizational structure of German labor institutions. However, continuity did not mean that the German-American side was always the beneficiary. These journalists also served important functions for their European comrades, since the papers they edited in the United States were read by fellow editors in Europe and extensively copied for European readership. Thus the editors of the *Sozial-Demokrat* in Zurich received all German-language labor papers from the United States and quoted them at length or summarized significant articles and information, just as the NYVZ and socialist dailies in other American cities did with the European labor papers. This mutual exchange reinforced ideological agreement on both sides of the Atlantic and helped Europeans to judge American developments on the basis of sound information. In addition, German-Americans served as foreign correspondents for German labor organs, providing firsthand accounts of specific events as well as overall analysis,

as did prominent German socialists who had been hired by German-American labor papers to report on German and European events. Sometimes journalists returned to Germany after working for German-American papers. After having published and edited the Chicago *Vorbote* and *Arbeiter-Zeitung* for several years, Conrad Konzett (like Hermann Schlüter, who had returned from Chicago during the depression of the 1870s) contributed his considerable knowledge to publishing the *Sozial-Demokrat* and a Swiss labor paper. Schlüter later went back to the United States, eventually becoming editor-in-chief of the NYVZ.²³ Especially after the antisocialist law had been repealed in Germany in 1890, other individuals also returned there and continued working for the labor press (Otto Reimer, Sergius Schewitsch, Otto Walster, Hepner, Biedenkapp). Thus, the trans-Atlantic job mobility of labor journalists and editors, as well as mutual visits, helped keep up the flow of information in this geographically extensive network.

But German-American labor papers were eventually forced to change their appearance and contents. They faced tough competition from the German-language middle-class press and were threatened with a declining readership, initially because of the lures of upward mobility and the actual growth of the middle class and later because of the increasing numerical preponderance of the second generation, which tended to turn from German-language to English-language publications (a development that affected middle-class papers equally). The papers' ethnic character became more pronounced and visible when the membership of ethnic associations had to be humored as a considerable part of the papers' readership. Mass consumerism, which took off at the beginning of the twentieth century, took its toll on all ethnic subcultures, and made the mass press more desirable to all classes of readers.

All of this could perhaps still be harmonized with the original purposes of these papers. It was especially the decline of the first and the growth of the second generation, though, that threatened the very existence of the radical (as well as the middle-class) press and its editors. The concern they voiced over this issue was quite ambivalent. As convinced socialists they argued and fought for the Americanization of the movement with all consequences that such an attitude entailed. Thus they deplored the lack of English-language labor papers and other socialist literature and actively tried to help remedy this situation. Pamphlets written in German by some of the more prominent journalists for agitational purposes were also translated by them into English, and English-language papers were funded by German socialists and edited and printed in the offices of German publishers.²⁴ At the

same time editors understood one of their major tasks to be the preservation of the German language and German culture. They claimed to be the true heirs of the German high cultural tradition, whereas in their opinion German-American middle-class papers had given in to mass popular tastes and lower standards, especially when it came to writing German and propagating German classical literature.²⁵

The conflict between the preservation of language and culture on the one hand and adaptation to American life and the English language on the other was easily solved in the case of German-language trade-union publications, because here first priority was given to union organization. Therefore all these papers except the *Deutsch-Amerikanische Buchdrucker-Zeitung* made the transition to English sometime between the mid-1880s and World War I, usually by first appearing as a bilingual publication before completely abandoning German pages. Editors of socialist dailies were keenly aware of the changing and declining social base of their readership. Because of its dual marginal status, that is, its ethnic as well as its ideologically "alien" character, the socialist daily press suffered more from this development than the middle-class press, even before events during World War I forced it into a quick decline. Taking up a discussion that had been going on for a generation, Robert Reitzel in 1890 predicted the fate of German cultural tradition, and by implication that (as he saw it) of its foremost guardians, the editors of the radical press, when he pessimistically (or should we rather say realistically?) observed, "This much is certain: German-American culture, brought over by immigrants in their flesh and blood, like their Lessing and Feuerbach and Börne, will die with us, who have lost their homeland and are strangers in their own house."²⁶

NOTES

1. Here reference is made only to the most important works, since practically no analysis of the 48ers has ignored the role of the press: Carl Wittke, *German Language Press in America*; Wittke, *Refugees of Revolution*; Wittke, *Against the Current*; Wittke, *Utopian Communist*; Adolf Eduard Zucker, ed., *The Forty-Eighters*; Ernst Bruncken, *German Political Refugees*; Robert E. Cazden, *Social History of the German Book Trade in America*; Eitel W. Dobert, *Deutsche Demokraten in Amerika*; Karl Obermann, *Joseph Weydemeyer; Germans for a Free Missouri*; Hermann Schlüter, *Die Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung in Amerika* [1907] and "Die Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung in New York und ihre Presse" [1903], pp. 8–12. For further bibliographical information see Karl J. R. Arndt and May E. Olson, *German-American Newspapers and Periodicals*; Don Heinrich Tolzman, *German-Americana*.

2. Wittke, *German Language Press in America*, chaps. 4 to 7.
3. Zucker, *Forty-Eighters*, pp. 269–357; the list is on p. 270.
4. *Glimpses of the German-American Radical Press*; Renate Kiesewetter, "Institution der deutsch-amerikanischen Arbeiterpresse in Chicago"; Elisabeth Pitzer, "Bürgerliche Presse und Arbeiterpresse im Wandel"; Ulrike Heider, *Der arme Teufel: Robert Reitzel vom Vormärz zum Haymarket*. So far, however, these radical papers have mostly been used for information on the respective radical movements and have not been analyzed as papers; cf. Carol Poore, *German-American Socialist Literature*; *Deutsch-amerikanische sozialistische Literatur*; *German Workers in Industrial Chicago*; Keil, ed., "Chicago-Projekt: Lebensweise und Kultur der deutschen Arbeiterschaft Chicagos"; Keil, ed., *Deutsche Arbeiterkultur in Chicago von 1850 bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg: Eine Anthologie* (Ostfildern, 1984), English translation published as *German Workers in Chicago: A Documentary History of Working-Class Culture from 1850 to World War I*; and *German Workers' Culture in the United States*.
5. I owe special thanks to Dirk Hoerder and Christiane Harzig, editors of *The Immigrant Labor Press in North America*, who generously made their work available to me in manuscript form, including detailed biographical information on about forty editors and journalists as well as data on when these persons worked for which paper. I also want to express my debt to Anne Spier, who compiled much of this biographical material. Without it (as well as without Arndt and Olson's bibliography) I would have been unable to compile the list of journalists (see Appendix). Further data were collected in connection with my own research, especially for my habilitation thesis, see n. 20.
6. "Konstitution des Verwaltungsrathes der 'Arbeiter-Zeitung,'" Papers of the International Workingmen's Association, Reel 1, misc., State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
7. *Vorbote*, July 18, 1874.
8. Jacob Winnen, letter "An den Ausschuss der sozialistischen Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands," Dec. 21, 1875, file 200/4/836, Institute for Marxism-Leninism, Moscow.
9. *Milwaukee'r Socialist*, Nov. 1, 1876; *Deutsch-Amerikanische Buchdrucker-Zeitung*, Aug. 1, Oct. 15, Nov. 1 and 15, Dec. 15, 1876, May 1, 1877.
10. Dieter Fricke, *Deutsche Arbeiterbewegung*, pp. 373f.
11. For a detailed analysis of the organizational structure of the *Vorbote* and the *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung* see Kiesewetter, "Institution der deutsch-amerikanischen Arbeiterpresse in Chicago."
12. *New Yorker Volkszeitung* (NYVZ), 10th anniversary issue, Jan. 28, 1888.
13. Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei von Nord-Amerika, *Offizielles Protokoll der 3. National-Konvention*, p. 10.
14. Carl Hirsch, *Die Parteipresse*, p. 3; quoted in Fricke, *Deutsche Arbeiterbewegung*, pp. 374f.
15. Alexander Jonas, "Wie die 'N.Y. Volkszeitung' entstand," NYVZ, 10th anniversary edition, repr. in 25th anniversary edition, p. 15.
16. Winnen, letter "An den Ausschuss," Dec. 21, 1875.

17. See Heinz Ickstadt and Hartmut Keil, "A Forgotten Piece of Working-Class Literature: Gustav Lyser's Satire of the Hewitt Hearing of 1878"; "'Unrealistische' Genossen: I. Heinrich Bartel," *Solidarität* 41, no. 7, 178–28; no. 9, 165–66; no. 10, 183–84.

18. See Hartmut Keil, "German Immigrant Working Class of Chicago."

19. August Otto-Walster, letter to Karl Marx, undated (written before Nov. 13, 1874), and letter to Marx, Nov. 13, 1874, Marx-Engels papers, D 3606 and D 3607, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam; letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht, Feb. 23, 1875, file 200/4/743, Institute for Marxism-Leninism, Moscow.

20. Dirk Hoerder and Hartmut Keil, "The American Case and German Social Democracy"; Hartmut Keil, "Deutsche sozialistische Einwanderer in den USA."

21. Jonas, "Wie die 'N.Y. Volkszeitung' entstand," p. 15.

22. These observations apply also to Theodor Cuno, Joseph Dietzgen, Hermann Schlüter, and Alexander Jonas.

23. See Hoerder and Keil, "The American Case and German Social Democracy."

24. See Hartmut Keil, "German Working-Class Radicalism."

25. For examples see Keil, ed., *Deutsche Arbeiterkultur in Chicago*, pp. 393–401.

26. Robert Reitzel, "Fremd im eigenen Hause," *Der arme Teufel*, Jan. 18, 1890.